

(Translation)

Mailed: November 6, 2007

NOTIFICATION OF REASONS FOR REJECTION

Patent Application No.: 2005-501985

Examiner's Notice Date: November 2, 2007

Examiner: T. Sato 9650 5L00

Representative for Applicant: Mr. Takehiko Suzuye (and seven others)

Applied Section: Main Provision of Section 29, Section 29 (2) and Section 36

This application is rejected on the grounds stated below. Any opinion about the rejection must be filed within THREE MONTHS of the mailing date hereof.

REASONS

1. The claims of the application do not satisfy the requirements under the main provision of Section 29 (1) of the Patent Law.
2. The application fails to satisfy the requirements under Section 36 (4) and (6) (i) and (ii) of the Patent Law, on the grounds that the specification and the drawings are defective in the following respects.
3. The inventions recited in the following claims are unpatentable under Section 29 (2) of the Patent Law, as being such that the inventions could easily have been made by a person with ordinary skill in the art to which the inventions pertain, on the basis of the inventions described in the following publications distributed in Japan or a foreign country prior to this application or the inventions made available to the public through electric telecommunication lines in Japan or a foreign country prior to this application.

REMARKS

(Reason 1)

Claims 1-41, 46, 47 and 62 do not specify what performs each step, and include descriptions of human acts. Therefore, the inventions of the method claims include processing performed based on a mental activity of a human. Even if what performs each step is clarified, the inventions of claims 1-82 cannot be regarded as a creation of a technical idea utilizing laws of nature since the information processing performed

using software is not specifically described with a hardware resource, for example, with respect to the descriptions "accepting document information", "determining...ad", "uses...ad relevance information", "includes an ad concept", and "submitting... a request for...ad." Therefore, the inventions of the claims are not the "statutory invention."

(Reason 2)

1. The recitation "rendering" and "browser chrome" in the claims are unclear as Japanese expressions or are technically unclear. Therefore, the claimed inventions are unclear.
2. The object of the present invention is to supply relevant ads. The specific means for achieving the object is not clearly recited in the claims. Therefore, the claims request a patent for a technology having a broader scope than the scope the present invention covers.

(Reason 3) (refer to "References Cited" for particulars)

- Claims 1-82
- References 1 and 2
- Note

As disclosed in References 1 and 2, the advertisement targeting technology of displaying relevant ads on a website is well known and common. The present invention is not particularly different from this technology.

The configuration of a server and clients, how to use a window when displaying ads, and the display timing are merely a matter of design choice that can be made by a person ordinarily skilled in the art, when necessary.

If a new reason for rejection is noticed, a further Official Action will be issued.

References Cited:

1. Jpn. Pat. Appln. KOKAI Publication No. 2001-243256
2. Jpn. Pat. Appln. KOKAI Publication No. 2002-108924

Prior Art Search Report

Searched Fields: IPC 8th G06F 17/30, G06Q10/00-50/00

Prior-Art Documents:

1. Jpn. Pat. Appln. KOKAI Publication No. 2002-245061
2. Jpn. Pat. Appln. KOKAI Publication No. 11-45278
3. Jpn. Pat. Appln. KOKAI Publication No. 2002-117049
4. Jpn. Pat. Appln. KOKAI Publication No. 2002-312363

The result of this prior art search does not constitute the reasons for rejection.